DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 235 866 JC 830 496

AUTHOR Ratcliff, James L.
TITLE Faculty Evaluation as a Measure of Organizational Productivity. Southern Association of Community and Junior Colleges Occasional Paper, Volume 2, Number 1.
INSTITUTION Southern Association of Community and Junior Colleges.
PUB DATE Jan 84
NOTE 6p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Collected Works - Serials (022)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; Community Colleges; *Faculty Evaluation; *Institutional Evaluation; *Productivity; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

Faculty evaluation can and should be a means for gathering information on the productivity of a community college. The concept of productivity implies a relationship between the quantity and the quality of the results achieved by the college to the resources invested. Productivity has two dimensions: effectiveness (i.e., the extent to which community college programs achieve their objectives) and efficiency (i.e., the way in which resources are organized to carry out college programs and functions at a minimal cost). Clear indicators of organizational productivity can be derived from evaluations of individual faculty productivity. To provide such information, faculty evaluation systems must be comprehensive, examining the responsibilities of the instructor as a subject matter expert, instructional delivery effectiveness, and faculty roles in curriculum development, student advisement, and community service. Using faculty evaluation as a measure of college productivity has several uses. It can provide: (1) an index of institutional progress toward stated goals; (2) guidance in the development of a college's human resources; (3) new standards of performance; and (4) a basis for performance incentives such as salary advances, promotions, release time, and sabbaticals. As a means of measuring institutional productivity, faculty evaluation can help colleges continue to improve service to students. (LAL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED235866

FACULTY EVALUATION AS A MEASURE OF ORGANIZATIONAL PRODUCTIVITY

by James L. Ratcliff

SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY
AND JUNIOR COLLEGES
OCCASIONAL PAPER
Volume 2, Number 1

January 1984

George B. Vaughan, Editor

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
G. B. Vaughan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

VC 830 496

Southern Association of Community and Junior Colleges Occasional Paper

George B. Vaughan, Editor

Volume 2, Number 1 January 1984

Faculty Evaluation As A Measure Of Organizational Productivity

by

James L. Ratcliff

The effectiveness and efficiency of community colleges are directly related to how well they utilize their resources. Community colleges are human capital intensive organizations. Faculty evaluation can and should be a means for gathering information on the productivity of the human capital investment. Productivity, as it is used here, is *not* a simple ratio of student credit hours to the number of faculty positions. Such a formula is an extremely limited quantitative measure of *instructional* productivity and does not reflect faculty contributions to curricular vitality, to the effectiveness of instruction, or to student advisement. Productivity improvements are increases in the quantity or quality of the college educational services relative to the resources committed to achieve them (Lee, 1977). Faculty evaluation can provide quantitative and qualitative measures of organizational efficiency and effectiveness.

Faculty evaluation may be formative; evaluation plans may be used to deduce how and in what areas faculty may improve. Or the evaluation may be summative; it may be used for the purposes of deciding whether the college should promote, retain, or grant continuous contract to the faculty member (Moomaw, 1977). The overall goal, nevertheless, of faculty evaluation is improvement of organizational performance (Arreola, 1983; Hammons, 1983).

Evaluation is a term meaningful within the context of decision-making; without a judgment, no evaluation has taken place. According to Paul Dressel (1976):

> The purpose of systematic evaluation is simply that of bringing to a conscious level and in a form to expedite decision making, the assumptions and values inherent in educational programs, to relate these to anticipated accomplishments, and to compare these plans with actual functioning and results (p. 12).

Yet, the literature on faculty evaluation provides little evidence that faculty evaluation systems provide the basis for institutional decision-making (Whitman and Weiss, 1982).

Current discussions of faculty evaluation are to serve as the basis for college decision-making. For example, McKeachie (1983) noted that there are generally three such purposes. Each of these involves a decision-point. One purpose is to help an individual faculty member improve. A second is to make some form of personnel decision. A third reason for evaluating faculty is to help students choose courses more wisely. Whitman and Weiss (1982) cite two generic purposes: (a) faculty improvement and (b) promotion, retention and tenure decisions. In articulating the conceptual framework of the National Faculty Evaluation Project for Community and Junior Colleges, Smith (1983) also distinguished between evaluation for faculty development and evaluation for personnel decision-making.

The above purposes have a commonality. They all suggest that faculty evaluation should provide the basis for decision-making in colleges. In the Southern Regional Education Board survey (SREB, 1977) of administrators at 536 colleges and universities, respondents believed that the "good" consequences of faculty evaluation outweighed the "bad" four to one. However, this study found no evidence that institutions with systematic faculty evaluation plans had characteristics of superior teaching and learning when compared to those colleges without such plans. While institutions with evaluation systems did gather information useful in personnel decision-making, the survey did not indicate that such information was regularly used for personnel decisions (Moomaw, 1977, pp. 79-81). Faculty evaluation programs are intended to improve organizational productivity, yet the literature on assessment of faculty performance has been primarily devoted to their design, development and application, rather than their impact, real or imagined, or organizational productivity. Cohen and Brawer (1982), in reviewing faculty evaluation plans of community and junior colleges, found that, while "the procedures gave the appearance of attempting to improve instruction, . . . they had little effect" (p. 75); the evaluation plans also affected only a "miniscule percentage" of the staff in personnel decisions.

The concept of productivity implies a relationship between the quantity and quality of results achieved by the community college to the resources invested to accomplish that achievement. Both qualitative and technological factors should be considered when setting the aim of faculty evaluation as increased productivity. If an instructor served 30 students in one class last term and served 33 students this term, productivity has risen ten percent. If an instructor serves an additional 30 students through instructional television, productivity has risen 100 percent. If the scores on the final examination for the class rise from last term's mean of 2.5 to this term's 3.0, productivity has risen 10 percent, also. If the instructor includes new curricular material in the class which better matches the course with the needs of the students' prospective employers, and the placement rate of the educational program rises 10 percent as a result, productivity has also risen commensurately. If that same instructor adopts a systematic procedure for student advisement whereby high risk students receive additional attention and interaction, and the attrition rate witin the program drops as a result, again productivity has risen. Both quantitative and qualitative measures are included in the concept of productivity, although the concept has rarely been applied to the output of instructors or community colleges (Lee, 1977). Nevertheless, if faculty evaluation is to be assessment of the performance of the human capital in the community college, such conceptualization may be warranted.

Productivity has two dimensions: effectiveness and efficiency. *Effectiveness* concerns the extent to which community college programs achieve their objectives. This presumes that decisions about what and how much the community college does are based on considered judgment of the relative importance and cost of meeting community needs. McKeachie (1983, p. 37) asserts that student achievement in college educational programs is the one criterion by which teacher effectiveness can be measured. Faculty evalaution, therefore, should be tied to college organizational effectiveness.

Efficiency concerns the way in which resources are organized to carry out college programs and functions at minimal costs. Efficiency may be expressed in several ways, including full-time equivalent students to full-time equivalent faculty, capital investment to credit and non-credit generation, and more broadly, least-cost combination of resources (Lee, 1977). Personnel decisions, such as reassignment, reduction-in-force, promotion, and the granting of tenure or continuous contract, are evaluative judgments about faculty which have profound implications for the efficiency with which community colleges operate.

Faculty are *the* major human capital of the community college. Each faculty member at a college contributes his or her area of expertise to a specific work role. Some faculty are skill trainers and vocational educators; some are humanists, some are scientists, and some are businesspeople. The variety of professional orientations of the community college may be amongst the richest in higher education; the value systems of the faculty cluster around such a diversity of subjects, disciplines and career fields. Community college faculty may have stronger commitment to teaching and stronger career affiliation with their institution than four-year college instructors (Bland, 1982-83). Nevertheless, the efficiency and effectiveness of the college are defined in community college faculty minds through their value orientations. Community college faculty are a graying population; those with the longest tenure appear to be less satisfied with their work than more recent additions to the faculty (Cohen and Brawer, 1982). While many of the original faculty came from secondary school backgrounds, more recent additions came from graduate schools, business and industry, and four-year colleges; the majority (57 percent) carry only a part-time allegiance to the community college (Cosand, 1983). Under such circumstances, the search for a uniform set of criteria by which to compare the performance of all faculty becomes extremely difficult, if not impossible.

The contribution of a faculty member to the college's effectiveness is conditioned by the nature of the work, i.e. the technology of the organization (Parson, 1951; Blau and Scott, 1962; Jencks and Riesman, 1968). Assembly line work does not allow for much personal discretion, but teaching requires continuous assessments of curriculum, of student performance, and of student direction and motivation in learning. The contribution of a faculty member to the college's effectiveness is conditioned by status, and that status is characterized by a high degree of discretionary decision-making (Clark, 1963). Who best can judge the expertise of a chemistry instructor other than another member of that scientific discipline? The point is that faculty are hired and retained for their expertise in a particular field; no wonder they often rebel against the notion of measuring their productivity through simplistic ratings of common notions of pedagogic practice alone.

Most community college faculty have major responsibilities in curriculum, instruction, and student advisement. Curriculum includes both the course design and the course content (Tyler, 1954). It is the embodiment of the expertise of the instructor. Peers within a discipline or teaching field can evaluate the expertise evidenced in student examinations, student papers, syllabi, or reading lists to see that the aims, design and measures of a course accomplish its purpose and contribute to the desired outcomes of the educational program (McKeachie, 1983). The quality of educational programs is an important index of community college effectiveness, and the curriculum is evidence of the expertise provided to and expected from students. Frequently curricula are not evaluated or, if evaluated, are evaluated by academic administrators for conformity to a common design, such as competency-based education. Rarely are curricula directly reviewed by other members of the same discipline. Too frequently curricular and programmatic reviews are conducted separately from faculty evaluations; such separation erases the possibility of noting faculty contributions to the ongoing revitalization of community college educational programs.

Faculty evaluation systems have tended toward *instructional* evaluation systems. Rather than examining the responsibilities of the individual as a subject matter expert, evaluation plans have tended to emphasize solely the delivery of instruction. Such evaluation often becomes a futile attempt to reduce the laboratory instruction of a horticulture teacher to a numerically comparable rating of the lecture of a nursing instructor. Research by Kolb (1981) indicates that differences in the content of the subject matter are related to differences in what constitutes effective teaching and effective learning; those differences are greater between teaching fields than within teaching fields.

The overemphasis on instruction as the sole measure of faculty productivity may contribute to faculty distrust of student and administrator ratings of teaching (Whitman and Weiss, 1982; McKeachie, 1983). Student evaluations of teaching, however, do appear to be the most valid measure of that instructional performance (Cohen, 1981). However, quality teaching involves both process and product. It includes both course method and course content. It also is comprised of formal and informal student-teacher interactions. Evaluation of instructional delivery needs to be combined with assessment of faculty roles in curriculum development, student advisement and community service in order to provide a more comprehensive view of faculty performance. Only with such a combination of measures can a comprehensive assessment of individual contributions to the organization be formulated. Clear indicators of organizational productivity can then be derived from such evaluations of individual productivity.

Advisement of students may be formal or informal. Informal advisement and consultation is an important part of the teaching-learning process (Roueche and Snow, 1977). Informal advisement includes the referral process by which less prepared students are guided to developmental education for assistance. Informal advisement includes faculty-student interactions which assist students in developing role models (Cohen and Brawer, 1972). Informal advisement (informal student-faculty interaction) is an identifiable, measurable factor affecting retention of students in the college programs (Pascarella, 1980), and therefore, is a critical measure of faculty contribution to organizational productivity. Research on faculty-student interactions and retention can provide paradigmatic design for faculty evaluation plans.

The major responsibilities of a community college faculty member have direct bearing on organizational effectiveness. Curriculum, instruction and advisement functions do have measures. All three of these measures should be constructed in such a manner as to recognize the uniqueness of a faculty member's expertise and resultant value system, as well as to include commonly held notions of what constitutes effective instruction.

The professional expertise of the faculty is a form of authority. It sets norms for instruction within the educational units of the community college. With such a variety of faculty values, there is no closely knit group of professionals who see the world from a single perspective. In multi-campus and larger community colleges, faculty are clustered by educational program and do not communicate greatly with faculty outside the norms of that institutional program or division. The collective control of faculty in curricular matters is not strong; there is a need to coordinate the work of the faculty in the various divisions and departments of community colleges. This administrative need to coordinate faculty behavior, together with the competing need of faculty to set and exercise norms of their teaching field, serves as the conceptual framework for a faculty evaluation plan designed to increase organizational productivity.

To enhance the effectiveness and the efficiency of the community college and to contribute to its vitality is to increase the effectiveness, the efficiency and the meaning of each work role. Faculty evaluation can help achieve this end; it can provide valuable strategic information for deciding how to maximize the human resources of the institution. Popular college faculty

evaluation plans, such as those developed by Miller (1974), Centra (1979), and Dressel (1976) place individual development as their foremost purpose and assume that the organization will benefit from such evaluation for development activities. Yet, evaluation plans themselves must be accountable; the merits of any evaluation plan must be judged in terms of the extent to which it improves the community college as well as the individual.

Not only should a faculty evaluation plan contribute to improved faculty performance and student achievement, but it should also provide an information basis for measuring community college productivity. Several reasons exist why colleges have not used faculty evaluation as a measurement of organizational productivity. Be the evaluation intended for personnel decision-making or staff improvement it has rarely served as the basis for structured change or incremental improvement in community college effectiveness. Transforming public dollars and community needs into educational outputs requires a clear determination of what community needs and desires exactly are. Cohen and Brawer (1982, p. 12) charge that community colleges often have preferred a philosophy of convenience over a plan for purposeful change. Establishing new programs provides service to new clientele, hence simple, rapid growth rates alone have been viewed as indicators of effective community colleges. There is great variance in the precision with which community colleges portray the purpose and services to their public. Likewise, there is great variance in the precision with which colleges identify community needs and interests (Ratcliff, 1982).

Faculty evaluation plans are only remotely tied to incentives in most community colleges. Faculty pay advancements, promotions, leaves, release time, fellowships and sabbaticals are infrequently tied to an evaluation plan that measures the individual's contribution to the organizational effectiveness. Advancement on salary schedules come from perseverance (time on the job) or from the random assemblage of college credits. Too often community college reward structures have assumed that raw qualification of *all* the time devoted to the job is an accurate measure of the learning that occurs through experience. Just as community colleges should grant credit to students from *learning* accrued through life experience not for experience alone, advancements on the salary schedule can be based on *learning* accrued through the teaching or work experience. But no such assessment of this learning which contributes to improved faculty performance has been found in the faculty evaluation plans reviewed here. Models for such assessment do exist in paradigmatic form. Many community colleges utilize the procedures recommended by the Council for the Advancement of Experiential Learning as a means for granting college credit to students for *learning* acquired through prior life experiences. Such learning is evaluated in relation to existing college course and program goals and objectives; the prior learning must be found to parallel in content and depth the instruction providec by the college. If faculty roles are more clearly defined in terms of performance measures, then prior work or teaching experience can be evaluated according to those measures, and the practice of simply rewarding time on the job (regardless of productivity) can be avoided.

Advancement on salary schedules and promotions have frequently resulted, in part, from the continued education of faculty members. Some community colleges have placed quotas on the number of degrees that can be acquired from one institution; this negative, often informal practice, is aimed at controlling the diversity and quality of faculty expertise. But, infrequently there is a strenuous, positive assessment of the benefit or value of the additional education to the faculty member's expertise, performance or value to the college. In community colleges faculty roles are divided along disciplinary lines with role tasks being divided among the three task categories. The American Association of University Professors in its "Statement on Teacher Evaluation" calls upon institutions to set forth specific expectations (a plan) for faculty evaluations (AAUP, 1975). The AAUP assumption is that such specific expectations are possible and desirable.

A look at some faculty role task areas demonstrates why such specific expectations of faculty are difficult to prepare. Centra found *service* as a task category to be ill-defined and infrequently rewarded or recognized (1977, p. 133). Ratcliff (1978) and Hammons (1983) reported that rarely are faculty evaluations used as a basis for either faculty rewards or faculty development. Poole and Dellow (1983) cited the problems encountered at North Country Community College prior to linking the evaluation plan with the reward structure of the college. Seldin (1975) and Knapper (1978) concluded that teaching is ill-rewarded in colleges and universities in comparison to research; it is lightly valued as a criteria for promotion and tenure decisions. These studies of faculty evaluation practices do not support the contention that evaluation currently articulates the assignment of faculty rewards or sanctions; evaluation is also frequently based on clearly specified tasks assigned to faculty.

Not only is there a lack of faculty rewards and sanctions clearly tied to evaluation plans, but incentives are also lacking for administrators to see that useful evaluations are performed. Evaluations infrequently impact college decision-making, or they impact decisions in the cases of a very limited number of faculty. If evaluations have little or no impact of decision-making, the department and division heads who allocate time required for a clear and thorough evaluation of the productivity of the faculty roles requires precious time in crowded administrative schedules (Genova and others, 1976). New systems of faculty evaluation cannot simply be added to administrative duties; times and dates in the college operational calendars should be set aside for each step in a systematic evaluation plan.

The expertise to measure faculty contributions to organizational productivity does exist. A benefit of a carefully constructed evaluation plan is that it can be used to predict and lead faculty behavior toward more effective community college programming. Like other forms of planning, administrators must see the value in faculty evaluation in order to commit the time and resources to the conduct of such activities.

Faculty evaluation is a planning activity. It commits administrators and faculty to a course of action. Colleges do not readily engage in planning activities unless the rewards for doing so are apparent (Richardson and Gardiner, 1983). Planning overcomes the politics of decision-making by subjugating the decision to a prescribed set of procedures; community college faculty and administrators do not readily give up their *power* to effect decisions through the college political process unless the benefits of planning outweigh the loss of control over those decisions. Faculty have gained much political control over the community college rewards structure. That control extends to the salary schedule through the collective action taken at the bargaining table. That control extends to the granting of release-time, professional leave, faculty fellowships and sabbaticals through either (or both) the college governance structure or the collective bargaining process. If faculty evaluation is to be designed and used to improve community college effectiveness, the reward structure of the college must first be more closely aligned with the evaluation process.

There are, of course, significant political overtones to the reshaping of faculty evaluation as a measure of community college productivity. As previously discussed, the political dimension of faculty acceptance of evaluation for organizational effectiveness rests, in part, on the inherent conflict between the technical and disciplinary authority of the faculty and the managerial authority of administration. This conflict, together with the loss of power experienced when planning supplants the politics of college decision-making, contributes to the reason why so few evaluation plans have led to improved faculty or college productivity.

Seen from the perspective of organizational development, faculty evaluation may be regarded as a form of survey-feedback intervention. That is, it is a plan to collect information from the workers about worker performance, to judge that information in light of organizational purpose, then to provide that information

back to the workers so that it may be used to reshape their work behavior. Survey-feedback interventions have not been shown to be effective in negative organizational climates — those climates where there is a lack of interest or commitment for improvement (Bowers, 1980, p. 518). Survey-feedback can be an effective intervention for organizational change if the opposition, lack of interest and political pressures are first abated.

The faculty and administration first need to see that performance gap — the gap between the overall current performance of the college and desired performance of the college. Jack Lindquist (1978, p. 16) states, "Unless organizational members, leaders of external supporters perceive a wide gap between what they think the organization should be doing and what it is doing, they are not likely to bother changing it." Faculty evaluation plans need a purpose beyond simple, vague notions of accountability or of faculty development. The purpose of the faculty evaluation effort can be tied to a clearly articulated strategic plan for the college. Once the college has set about trying to influence its own destiny, trying to match its activities and services with its future clientele, then the purpose and criteria for faculty evaluation can more clearly be defined within the context of college productivity.

Using faculty evaluation as a measure of college productivity has several uses. The evaluation can provide an index of progress. As faculty and adminstration work toward a more integrated general education sequence or adapt curricula to changing in technology, faculty evaluations can serve as a collective indicator of college progress toward stated goals of student development or business-industrial training. A faculty evaluation plan can also guide the development of the college's human resources and be used to develop new standards of performance. Such a plan can dramatize to constituencies internal and external to the college the diversity of talents and resources available and thus regenerate efforts to determine the reasons for faculty success and whether these reasons can be shared with other faculty to treat the causes of poor showing.

Faculty evaluation as a measure of college productivity can serve as a basis for performance incentives that can be used by college administrators and by faculty union leadership in reassessing working conditions. Models of merit-oriented, talent-oriented, and expertise oriented bargaining units can be found in the local symphony or in professional football teams. Players are guaranteed a base salary, plus contracts reflecting their meritorious achievements as first violinist or quarterback. For a faculty evaluation plan to be effective, it must provide a process by which excellent service is distinguished from the merely adequate fulfillment of work responsibilities.

To make the distinction between the superior, the adequate, and the inadequate requires a faculty evaluation plan which encompasses more than instruction. It must address all major work functions of each individual faculty member. It should be construed in such a way as to ackowledge and to assess the technical expertise of the faculty. To be comprehensive, it will be both formative and summative, but it must be on-going and thorough. The role of an individual faculty member is a complex one, filled with discretionary activities, but the task of a truly effective evaluation plan is simply to describe what the faculty member contributes to the productivity of the college.

Community colleges today want to continue to improve services to students. They want to maximize the talents of their faculty and staff. They want to match those talents with their changing curriculum. They want to enrich faculty work roles so that students may be able to utilize more fully faculty abilities. They want to eliminate duplication of effort by staff and duplication of curriculum in the organization. They want to clarify responsibility, accountability, and authority. They can do all of this, better, as more precise ways of describing faculty behavior are developed.

James L. Ratcliff is Associate Professor and Section Leader of Higher Education, Iowa State University.

REFERENCES

AAUP. "Statement on Teacher Evaluation," Washington, DC: 1975.

Arreola, Raoul A. "Establishing Successful Faculty Evaluation and Development Programs," in A. Smith (Ed.) *Evaluating Faculty and Staff. New Directions for Community Colleges*, no. 41, March 1983, pp. 83-93.

Blau, P., and Scott, W.R. *Formal Organizations*. San Francisco: Chandler, 1962.

Bland, William D. "Role Orientations and Evaluation of Professional Performance," *Community College Review*, 10(3), Winter 1982-83, 27-32.

Bowers, David G. "OD Techniques and Their Results in Twenty-Three Organizations: The Michigan ICL Study," in D. Katz, R.L. Kahn and J.S. Adams (Eds.), *The Study of Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

Centra, J.A. *Determining Faculty Effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

Centra, John A. *How Universities Evaluate Faculty Performance: A Study of Department Heads*. Graduate Record Examination Board Research Report No. 75-5bR. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service, 1977.

Clark, Burton R. *The Study of Academic Administration*. Berkeley: Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of California, 1963.

Cohen, Arthur M. and Florence B. Brawer. *Confronting Identity: The Community College Instructor*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

Cohen, Arthur M. and Florence B. Brawer. *The American Community College*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

Cohen, Peter A. "Student Ratings of Instruction and Student Achievement," *Review of Educational Research*, 51(3), Fall 1981, 281-310.

Cosand, Joseph. "Who Will Make the Decision?" *Community College Review*, 10(4), Spring 1983, 24-29.

Dressel, P.L. *Handbook of Academic Evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.

Genova, William J., Marjorie K. Madoff, Robert Chin, and George B. Thomas. *Mutual Benefit Evaluation of Faculty and Administrators in Higher Education*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger, 1976.

Hammons, James. "Faculty Development: A Necessary Corollary to Faculty Evaluation," in A. Smith (Ed.) *Evaluating Faculty and Staff. New Directions for Community Colleges*, no. 41, March 1983, pp. 75-82.

Jencks, Christopher and Riesman, David. *The Academic Revolution*. New York: Doubleday, 1968.

Katz, Daniel, and Kahn, Robert. *The Social Psychology of Organizations*. 2nd ed. New York: Wiley, 1978.

Knapper, Christopher K. "Evaluation and Teaching: Beyond Lip Service," a Paper presented at the Fourth International Conference on Improving University Teaching, Hockschuldidaktisches Zentrum, Aachen, F.R. Germany, July 26-29, 1978. ED 165 662.

Kolb, David A. "Learning Styles and Disciplinary Differences," in A.W. Chickering and Associates, *The Modern American College*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.

Lee, John W. "Overcoming the Organizational Productivity Paradox in Postsecondary Education", in R.L. Breuder (Ed.), *Management Principles for the Community College Administrator*. Cocoa, FL: Brevard Community College, 1977.

Lindquist, Jack. *Strategies for Change*. Berkeley: Pacific Soundings Press, 1978.

Miller, Richard I. *Developing Programs for Faculty Evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

McKeachie, Wilbert J. "The Role of Faculty Evaluation", *National Forum* 63(2), Spring 1983, 37-39.

Moomaw, W. Edmund. "Practices and Problems in Evaluating Instruction", J.A. Centra (Ed.) *Renewing and Evaluating Teaching. New Directions for Higher Education*, no. 17, Spring 1977, pp. 77-92.

Pascarella, Ernest T. "Student-Faculty Informal Contact and College Outcomes", *Review of Educational Research*, 50(4), Winter 1980, 545-596.

Parson, Talcott. *The Social System*. New York: Free Press, 1951.

Poole, Lawrence H. and Donald A. Dellow. "Evaluation of Full-Time Faculty", in A. Smith (Ed.) *Evaluating Faculty and Staff. New Directions for Community Colleges*, no. 41, March 1983, pp. 75-82.

Ratcliff, James L. "Linking Faculty Evaluation and Academic Development to Improve College Teaching," a paper presented at the Fourth International Conference on Improving University Teaching, Hockschuldidaktisches Zentrum, Aachen, F.R. Germany, July 26-29, 1978.

Ratcliff, James L. "The Role of Needs Assessment in a Period of Retrenchment", *Community Services Catalyst*, 12(2), Spring 1982, 21-23.

Richardson, Richard C., Jr., and Don E. Gardner. "Avoiding the Extremes on the Planning Continuum," *Journal of Higher Education*, 54(2), March/April 1983, 164-179.

Roueche, John E. and Jerry Snow. *Overcoming Learning Problems*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Seldin, Peter. *How Colleges Evaluate Professors*. New York: Blythe-Pennington, 1975.

Smith, Al. "A Conceptual Framework for Staff Evaluation", in A. Smith (Ed.) *Evaluating Faculty and Staff. New Directions for Community Colleges*, no. 41, March 1983, pp. 83-93.

Southern Regional Education Board. *Faculty Evaluation for Improved Learning*. Atlanta, 1977.

Tyler, Ralph W. *Basic Principles of Curriculum Development*. University of Chicago Press, 1954.

Whitman, Neal and Elaine Weiss. *Faculty Evaluation: The Use of Explicit Criteria for Promotion, Retention and Tenure*. ERIC-AAHE Research Report No. 2, 1982.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges DEC 9 1983